AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR

WEEKLY NEWS SERVICE

Entered as second-class matter September 30, 1912, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of August 24, 1912. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Sec. 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized July 11, 1918.

WHOLE NO. 1207 WILLIAM GREEN, President WASHINGTON, D. C., SATURDAY, JUNE 2, 1934 FRANK MORRISON, Secretary VOL. 24, NO. 22

Every addition to human knowledge is an addition to man power. —Horace Mann.

Editorials

Labor and the Law

The inexcusable delays in securing the rights of labor by the medium of statute law—which in the last analysis means the medium of courts and judges—is once more emphasized in the refusal of Federal Judge John P. Nields of the United States District Court in Wilmington, Delaware, to issue the injunction petitioned for by the Government to restrain the Weirton Steel Company from violating the labor section of the National Industrial Recovery Act regarding the election of collective bargaining representatives by the employes of the company.

The Weirton case is a simple one. The Recovery Act prescribes that every code of fair competition established under it shall contain the guarantee that employes shall have the right to organize and bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing, and "shall be free from the interference, restraint, or coercion of employers of labor, or their agents, in the designation of such representatives." This guarantee is included in the code for the iron and steel industry, to which the Weirton Steel Company is a party.

Officers of the Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel and Tin Workers charged that company officials were interfering with the election of representatives. The National Labor Board sustained the charge and ordered an election held under the auspices of the Board. Company officials interfered with this proposed election to such an extent that it was not held. The Board thereupon turned the matter over to the Department of Justice for appropriate action.

After a long delay the Justice Department petitioned Judge Nields to issue a temporary injunction restraining the company from interfering with the election of collecive bargaining representatives guaranteed by the Recovery Act. Counsel for the Government and the company argued the case for a week before Judge Nields in March. Now comes Judge Nield's decision denying the injunction. He declares that the Norris-LaGuardia anti-injunction law prohibits a Federal judge from issuing an injunction in a labor dispute without a hearing of witnesses in open court, that in the Weirton case is a labor dispute, and that he is therefore prohibited by the anti-injunction law from issuing the injunction. This means that there will have to be a new hearing or trial before Judge Nields, with witnesses for the Government and the steel company present to give their testimony in person and submit to cross-examination.

Inasmuch as the District Court's docket is crowded and the vacation season for judges will soon be at hand, it will probably be September or October before the case is retried. The side which suffers an adverse decision will appeal to the United States Supreme Court, which normally means additional months of delay. Competent lawyers familiar with similar cases predict that it will be a year and a half from the time the Weirton Steel Company committed the alleged violation before the Supreme Court decides the controversy. In the meantime, subversive employers throughout the United States are using this contested case as justification for wholesale flouting of Section 7-A, which friends of labor believed would be a charter of liberty for working men and women.

There is just one adequate answer to inexcusable delays of this sort in determining labor's rights by statute laws and court decisions. That answer is, the development of effective trade unions in every industry thoroughly equipped with a knowledge of the economic rights of workers and strong enough to enforce those rights by the mobilization of labor's economic power without waiting for legislative enactments or court decrees.

Fictitious NRA Minimum Wages

The fiction of minimum wages under NRA codes of fair competition is completely exploded by the controversy over curtailment of production ordered for the cotton textile industry by the National Recovery Administration, which resulted in a strike threat being issued by the United Textile Workers of America.

The cotton textile code prescribes $13 for a 40-hour week as the minimum wage in the North and $12 in the South. People in general understood that these were real minimum wages which Tory employers, despite the depression, could not deny the weekly earnings of thousands of textile workers who do practically all the useful work in the manufacture of cotton goods. The NRA order dispelled this illusion and imposed a 25 per cent wage cut.

The circumstances under which the minimum wage bubble went to pieces are instructive. From the inauguration of the maximum 40-hour week, the unpatriotic low-wage and high-profit capitalists who control the cotton textile industry installed "stretch-out" and other speed-up systems by which the output of the workers was largely increased solely for the benefit of employers and their financial backers. The mill owners concluded that this increased output under the 40-hour week would result in the production of more goods than the present buying power of consumers could absorb. Therefore the Cotton Textile Code Authority, which administers the code, requested the Recovery Administration an order for a 25 per demanded from the National Recovery Administration. This meant a reduction of 10 hours in the cent curtailment of production. This meant a reduction of 10 hours in the maximum work week, bringing it down to 30 hours, with the manufacturers insisting that the minimum weekly wages should be correspondingly cut from $12 to $9 in the South, from $13 to $9.75 in the North, and similar reductions in the weekly wages of semi-skilled and skilled workers.

The officials of the United Textile Workers protested against the pay cut. But the NRA sided with the manufacturers and ordered the curtailment, with all the employes standing all the injuries and the bad times barons grabbing all the benefits.

This reduction in the already inadequate wages of thousands of textile workers is essentially unjust and a denial of the demand for shorter hours workers is essentially unjust and a denial of the demand for shorter hours workers is essentially unjust and a denial of the demand for shorter hours